REMARKS

The pending Office Action imposed a restriction requirement based on an alleged lack of unity of invention. The Groups posed are:

I. An immunostimulant composition comprising 4-amino-2-ethoxy-methyl-α,α-dimethyl-1-H-imidazo[4,5c]-quinoline-1-ethanol; and

II. An immunostimulant composition comprising ER804057.

The compound recited in Group I is an agonist of the Toll-like 7 receptor and the compound recited in Group II is an agonist of the Toll-like 4 receptor. On page 4 of the Action, the Office stated, "The composition [sic] claimed contain at least one agonist of the Toll-like 7 receptor or of the Toll-like 8 receptor, which does not define a contribution over the prior art." But the claims are not directed to compositions comprising least one agonist of the Toll-like 7 receptor or of the Toll-like 8 receptor. Rather, the claims are directed to compositions comprising one of those in combination with an agonist of the Toll-like 4 receptor.

On January 8, 2008, the undersigned contacted the examiner for clarification. It was agreed that a complete response to the restriction requirement would be the election of either a) a composition comprising an agonist of the Toll-like 7 receptor and an agonist of a Toll-like 4 receptor, or b) a composition comprising an agonist of the Toll-like 8 receptor and an agonist of a Toll-like 4 receptor. The applicants elect the former, i.e., a composition comprising an agonist of the Toll-like 7 receptor and an agonist of a Toll-like 4 receptor.

If it is believed that a teleconference will advance prosecution, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned as indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 30, 2008

/Michael S. Greenfield/
Michael S. Greenfield
Registration No. 37,142

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

Telephone: 312-913-0001
Facsimile: 312-913-0002